

**BLAKELY
SOKOLOFF
TAYLOR &
ZAFMAN**

A LIMITED LIABILITY
PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING
LAW CORPORATIONS

1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94086
(408) 720-8598 (Telephone)
(408) 720-9397 (Facsimile)

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JAN 09 2006


EXPEDITED POCEDURE REQUESTED

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET (TRANSMITTAL TO PTO)

Deliver to: Examiner A. Rao
Firm Name: U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Fax Number: 571-273-8300 Telephone No.: _____
From: Sheryl Sue Holloway
Date: January 9, 2006 Time: 3 pm (Pacific Time)
Operator: Cheri Clinkenbeard Matter: 80398.P496
Number of pages including cover sheet: 10
In Re Patent Application of: Paniconi, et al.
Application No.: 10/052,699
Filed: 1/17/02
For: Motion Segmentation System with Multi Frame Hypothesis Tracking
Enclosed are the following documents: a copy of the Appendix A (6 pgs.), a
Photocopy of the date stamped return-receipt postcard (1 pg).

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on:

Date of Transmission January 9, 2006
Cheri Clinkenbeard
(Typed or printed name of person transmitting paper)

(Signature of person transmitting paper)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law firm of Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP that is confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

IF YOU EXPERIENCE ANY DIFFICULTY IN RECEIVING THE ABOVE PAGES, PLEASE CALL (408) 720-8598 AND ASK FOR THE OPERATOR NAMED ABOVE.

Attorney's Docket No.: 080398.P496

JAN 09 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

Paniconi, et al.

Application No.: 10/052,699

Filed: January 17, 2002

For: Motion Segmentation System with
Multi Frame Hypothesis Tracking

Examiner: Rao, A.

Art Unit: 2613

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450Correspondence

On September 13, 2005, Applicant submitted an Appeal Brief (5 pages) along with an Appendix A (6 pages) containing the currently pending claims. An itemized stamped return-receipt postcard was date stamped September 15, 2005 by the USPTO and returned to us. The postcard indicates that the office received the Appendix A.

In response to the communication regarding the Appeal Brief dated December 29, 2005, a copy of the Appendix A and a photocopy of the date stamped return-receipt postcard included herewith. Applicant believes no extension of time is due because the postcard is evidence the Appendix A was timely filed.


Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to our Deposit Account

No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: Jan. 9, 2006


Sheryl Sue Holloway
Reg. No.: 37,850

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

RECEIVED

SEP 19 2005

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
LOS ANGELES

Application No.: 10/052,699 Filing/Issue Date: 1/17/02 Docket No.: 80398.P496
 Date Mailed: 9/13/05 Due Date(s): 9/13/05 Atty/Sec: SSH/cle
 Client: Sony Electronics Inc.
 Title: Motion Segmentation System with Multi-Frame Hypothesis Tracking
 First Named Inventor: Paniconi
 The following has been received in the U.S.P.T.O. on the date stamped hereon:

Transmittal Letters & Certificate of Mailing <input type="checkbox"/> Transmittal Letter (1 pg.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal (3 pgs. each) <input type="checkbox"/> RCE (Request for Continued Examination) <input type="checkbox"/> Transmittal of Formal Drawings <input type="checkbox"/> Issue Fee Transmittal (1 pg) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certificate of Mailing <input type="checkbox"/> Express Mail No.: -Expressmail Missing Parts, Formal Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Notice of Missing Parts <input type="checkbox"/> Assignment & Cover sheet (____ pgs.) <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration & POA (____ pgs.) Amendment / Response <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Response (____ pgs.) <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner Interview Summary (____ pgs.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Appendix A (6 pgs.)</u>	Petitions & Appeals <input type="checkbox"/> Petition for Extension of Time: <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Appeal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Brief (5 pgs. each) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply Brief (____ pgs.) Other <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement & PTO/SB/08 (____ pgs.) (previously 1449) <input type="checkbox"/> Request to Publish (Rescind NonPublication) <input type="checkbox"/> Drawings: ____ sheets, ____ figures <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postcard Checks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check No. <u>0043</u> Amount \$ <u>500-</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Check No. ____ Amount \$ ____
--	--

Date 1/13/2006 Client: Sony Electronics Inc.
 Docket Initials ✓ 80398.P496
 Dock. Sup. Initials ____
 Atty Initials ____ SSH
 Pat/Ser/Reg 052699 142
 Description:

Watch for examiner's answer to appeal; appeal brief filed 9/13/2005

9/26/2005

Clcto Cadano

457765

ENTERED
INTO SONY DB

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 09 2006

Atty Docket No. 080398.P496

Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:) Examiner:	Rao, Anand Shashikant
)	
Paniconi, et al.) Art Unit:	2613
)	
Application No. 10/052,699)	
)	
Filed: January 17, 2002)	
)	
For: MOTION SEGMENTATION)	
SYSTEM WITH MULTI-FRAME)	
HYPOTHESIS TRACKING)	
)	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPENDIX A FOR
APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

1. (Previously amended) A method comprising:

identifying a plurality of motion classes for a frame of video data, each motion class having at least one region classified thereto, wherein a region is poorly classified if it is classified as belonging to an improper class;

determining a region to be a poorly classified region;

forming a set of class hypotheses for the poorly classified region, the set of class hypotheses containing at least one possible motion class;

determining a similarity measure for the poorly classified region with respect to a set of past and future video data, the similarity measure indicating a degree of consistency between a hypothesis for the motion of the poorly classified region and the motion of the corresponding regions in past and future frames; and

reclassifying the poorly classified region to one of the at least one possible motion classes according to the similarity measure.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the set of past and future video data comprises:

- at least one preceding frame of video data; and
- at least one succeeding frame of video data.

3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein reclassifying according to the similarity measure includes:

determining which of the at least one possible motion classes are suitable for the poorly classified region using the similarity measure.

4. (Original) The method of claim 3 wherein reclassifying further includes:

assigning the poorly classified region to a motion class of the at least one possible motion class with an optimal similarity measure.

5. (Original) The method of claim 4, wherein the optimal similarity measure is a minimum similarity measure.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein determining a region to be a poorly classified region comprises:

- measuring the distortion of a region;
- comparing the measured distortion of the region to a distortion threshold; and
- determining the region to be poorly classified if the measured prediction is greater than the prediction error threshold.

7. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein determining a region to be a poorly classified region comprises:

- measuring the prediction error of a region;

comparing the measured prediction error of the region to a prediction error threshold; and

determining the region to be poorly classified if the measured prediction is greater than the prediction error threshold.

8. (Previously amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the reclassification of a poorly classified region in an image comprises finding the minimum of a measure over all class hypotheses according to the equations $\arg \min_i (A(K_i))$, where K_i is a class hypothesis, indexed by i , $A(K_i) = \min(A_{past}(K_i), A_{past/future}(K_i))$, $A_{past/future} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_t \sum_B D(K_i^{past/future}, K_i)$; $A_{past/future}$ is a measure of the consistency through the distortion quantity, D , between a hypothetical class K_i and its corresponding class $K_i^{past/future}$ on past/future frames.

9. (Previously amended) A computer-readable medium comprising computer program instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform a hypothesis algorithm comprising:

identifying a plurality of motion classes for a frame of video data, each motion class having at least one region classified thereto, wherein a region is poorly classified if it is classified as belonging to an improper class;

determining a region to be a poorly classified region;

forming a set of class hypotheses for the poorly classified region, the set of class hypotheses containing at least one possible motion class;

determining a similarity measure for the poorly classified region with respect to a set of past and future video data, the similarity measure indicating a degree of consistency between a hypothesis for the motion of the poorly classified region and the motion of the corresponding regions in past and future frames; and

reclassifying the poorly classified region to one of the at least one possible motion classes according to the similarity measure.

10. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the set of past and future video data comprises:

at least one preceding frame of video data; and
at least one succeeding frame of video data.

11. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein determining a region to be a poorly classified region comprises:

measuring the distortion of a region;
comparing the measured distortion of the region to a distortion threshold; and
determining the region to be poorly classified if the measured prediction is greater than the prediction error threshold.

12. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein determining a region to be a poorly classified region comprises:

measuring the prediction error of a region;
comparing the measured prediction error of the region to a prediction error threshold; and
determining the region to be poorly classified if the measured prediction is greater than the prediction error threshold.

13. (Previously amended) A video device comprising:

means for forming a set of class hypotheses for a region of a frame of video data;
means for determining a similarity measure for the region with respect to a set of past and future video data; and
means for reclassifying the region according to the similarity measure if the region has been poorly classified as belonging to an improper class.

14. (Original) The video device of claim 13, wherein the set of past and future data comprises:

at least one preceding frame of video data; and
at least one succeeding frame of video data.

15. (Original) The video device of claim 13, further comprising:

means for determining a region to be poorly classified by a) measuring the distortion of a region, b) comparing the measured distortion of the region to a distortion threshold, and c) determining the region to be poorly classified if the measured prediction is greater than the prediction error threshold.

16. (Original) The video device of claim 13, further comprising:

means for determining a region to be poorly classified by a) measuring the prediction error of a region, b) comparing the measured prediction error of the region to a prediction error threshold, and c) determining the region to be poorly classified if the measured prediction is greater than the prediction error threshold.

17. (Previously amended) A video device comprising:

a motion compensation component configured to form a set of class hypotheses for a region of a frame of video data, to determine a similarity measure for the region with respect to a set of past and future data, and to reclassify the region according to the similarity measure if the region has been poorly classified as belonging to an improper class.

18. (Original) The video device of claim 17, wherein the set of past and future data comprises:

at least one preceding frame of video data; and
at least one succeeding frame of video data.

19. (Original) The video device of claim 17, wherein the region is reclassified by finding the minimum similarity measure and assigning the region to a class having the minimum similarity measure.

20. (Previously amended) A method comprising:

performing motion estimation for a frame containing a plurality of motion classes, each motion class having at least one region classified thereto, wherein a region is poorly classified if it is identified as belonging to an improper class;

identifying at least one poorly classified region;

selecting a new motion class for each poorly classified region;

reclassifying the poorly classified region to the new motion class; and

re-estimating the poorly classified region based on a result of reclassifying the poorly classified region.

21. (Original) The method of claim 20 wherein reclassifying includes:

using a set of past and future data according to a hypothesis tracking algorithm.